

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-21 were pending (Claims 22-37 were previously withdrawn) of which Claims 1-4, 8-18, 20, and 21 were rejected and Claims 5-7 and 19 were objected to. Claims 1, 6, 10, 15 and 20 have been amended and Claims 2-5 and 16-19 have been cancelled.

The Examiner objected to Claims 5-7 and 19 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 1 has been rewritten to include the limitations of Claim 5 and intervening Claims 2, 3. Claim 15 has been amended to include the limitations of Claims 19 and intervening Claim 17. Thus, the scope of amended Claims 1 and 15 have not been narrowed as compared to original Claims 5 and 19.

Claim 6 is amended to properly depend from amended Claim 1 rather than cancelled Claim 5.

Claim 10 is amended to include limitations based on original Claims 3 and 5. This amendment is supported by at least original claims 3 and 5.

Claim 20 is amended to depend from amended Claim 15 rather than cancelled claim 16.

No new matter has been added in the claims.

Drawings

The drawings were objected to because of various informalities. Specifically the Examiner stated that

Drawings 3A and 3B have packet labels of the form "T1|1," "T2|1," etc. After reading the specification, the examiner believes these packets should be labeled in the form --T1U1--, --T2U2--, etc. Fig. 4B shows several packets having labels of TOP1, T1P1, and T2P1. The examiner believes the second set of these labels should read --TOP2--, --T1P2--, --T2P2--, etc.

Figs 3A, 3B and 4B have been amended as requested by the Examiner. Replacement sheets are filed with this Amendment. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requires reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the drawings.

Claim Objections

Claim 19 were objected to as containing informalities. In particular, with regards to Claim 19 the Examiner stated "the claim recites 'wherein the packet from the second compressed video stream...' The examiner believes the claim should read -wherein the first packet from the second compressed video stream...--" The examiner also stated that "with such an amendment, the claim would be objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims."

Claim 15 has been amended to include all the limitations of Claim 19 and intervening Claim 17. In addition Claim 15 includes the correction of the informality of original Claim 19. Therefore Claim 19 is cancelled. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the objection of Claim 19 is rendered moot.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-4 and 15-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Naimpally (5,619,337). However the Examiner also stated that Claims 5-7 and 19 are "objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims."

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 5 and intervening Claims 2 and 3. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Amended Claim 1 is allowable. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submits that Claims 6-9 which depend from amended Claim 1 are also allowable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of Claim 1 and 6-9. The rejections of claims 2-4 are rendered moot by the cancellation of Claims 2-4.

Claim 15 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 19 and intervening Claim 17 as well as original Claim 16. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Amended Claim 15 is allowable. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submits that Claims 20-21, which depend from amended Claim 15 are also allowable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 15, 20 and 21. The rejection of Claims 16-19 are rendered moot by the cancellation of Claims 16-19.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 8-14 and 20-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Naimpally.

Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 8-9, which depend from amended Claim 1 are patentable for at least the reasons given above with respect to Claim 1. Similarly, Applicant respectfully

submits that Claims 20-21, which depend from Claim 15 are patentable for at least the reasons given above with respect to Claim 15. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 8-9 and 20-21.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 10 is rendered moot by the amendment of Claim 10 to include limitations based on Claims 3 and 5. Specifically, Claim 10 has been amended to recite:

wherein the video interleaver and disk writer are configured to write a first packet from the first plurality of packets to the storage medium prior to writing a first packet from the second plurality of packets to the storage medium; and

wherein the video interleaver and disk writer are configured to write the first packet from the second plurality of packets is written to the storage medium prior to writing a second packet from the first plurality of packets to the storage medium.

Because the Examiner indicated that Claim 5 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 10 is allowable. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submit that Claims 11-14, which depend from Claim 10 are likewise allowable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 10-14.

SILICON VALLEY
PATENT GROUP LLP

2350 Mission College Blvd
Suite 360
Santa Clara, CA 95054
(408) 982-8200
FAX (408) 982-8210

Conclusion

Claims 1, 6, 10, 15, and 20 have been amended. Claims 2-5 and 16-19 have been cancelled leaving Claims 1, 6-15, and 20-21 pending. For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully request allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner have any questions concerning this response, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (408) 857-0559.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward Mao

Edward S. Mao
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 40,713

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING BY "FIRST CLASS"

I hereby certify that this paper or fee is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the below date.

Edward Mao

Edward S. Mao

December 15, 2005

Date

SILICON VALLEY
PATENT GROUP LLP

2350 Mission College Blvd
Suite 360
Santa Clara, CA 95054
(408) 982-8200
FAX (408) 982-8210

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figs. 3A, 3B and 4B.

Specifically, Please amend Figs. 3A and 3B by replacing the packet labels of the form "T1|1", "T2|2", etc., with labels of the form of --T1U1--, --T2U2--, etc., as requested by the Examiner. A replacement sheet is submitted with this amendment.

Please amend Fig. 4B by replacing the second set of labels "TOP1", "T1P1", and "T2P1" with labels --TOP2--, --T1P2--, --T2P2--, etc., as requested by the Examiner. A replacement sheet is submitted with this amendment.